

The Planning Commission for the City of Junction City met on Tuesday, May 20, 2014 at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall, 680 Greenwood Street, Junction City Oregon.

PRESENT WERE: Chair, Jason Thiesfeld, Commissioners, Sandra Dunn, Jeff Haag, Robert Solberg, James Hukill, and Jack Sumner; Contracted Planner (LCOG), Gary Darnielle; City Administrator, Melissa Bowers; and Planning Secretary, Tere Andrews;
ABSENT: None

I. OPEN MEETING AND REVIEW AGENDA

Chair Thiesfeld opened the meeting at 6:30 pm and led the Pledge of Allegiance. He then reviewed the agenda.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

• **APRIL 15, 2014**

Motion: Commissioner Sumner made a motion to approve the April 15, 2014 minutes as written. Commissioner Dunn seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed by a vote of 6:0:0. Chair Thiesfeld, Commissioners Dunn, Sumner, Haag, Solberg and Hukill voted in favor.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT (FOR ITEMS NOT ALREADY ON THE AGENDA)

There were none.

IV. PADDOCK FINAL PLAT

Planner Darnielle reviewed the application for the Paddock final. The final plat met all conditions set forth in the preliminary partition final order. Staff recommended approval of the final plat. If approved, the applicant would then have 90-days to record the plat with Lane County.

Motion: Commissioner Haag made a motion to approve the Paddock Final Plat Partition as presented. Commissioner Dunn seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed by a vote of 6:0:0. Chair Thiesfeld, Commissioners Dunn, Sumner, Haag, Solberg and Hukill voted in favor.

V. DISCUSSION: POSSIBLE PLANNING COMMISSION BY-LAWS UPDATE (13-07)

Secretary Andrews reviewed a request by the Planning Commission to consider possible updates to the Planning Commission By-Laws. Discussion took place at the December 2013 Planning Commission meeting, at that time there were Commissioner Suggestions to review the application and application process. The By-Laws were updated in 2009. Staff requested Commission direction on two (2) open items from the 2009 By-Law updates.

A discussion took place regarding the membership of the Planning Commission. The current By-Laws stated the Mayor and Building Inspector were ex officio members of the Commission. Current practice did not match the By-Laws. Staff reviewed the 2009 Planning Commission minutes regarding the Mayor as an ex officio member of the Planning Commission. The minutes were inconclusive.

Administrator Bowers and Mayor Brunscheon reviewed the Planning Commission By-Laws. Mayor Brunscheon was present for the Planning Commission discussion on the topic.

Current State statute allowed for two (2) ex officio members of the Planning Commission but did not specify further. Thus, who the ex officio members were was up to the local jurisdictions.

Commissioner Haag asked Mayor Brunscheon for his opinion.

Mayor Brunscheon asked Planner Darnielle for his observations from other communities.

Planner Darnielle replied typically, most Planning Commission did not have ex officio members unless it was possibly a member of the City Council.

Mayor Brunscheon did not want to see that position removed. There could be times when the Mayor's input would be beneficial. His question was, if the By-Laws were not changed would it be required of the Mayor to be on the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Dunn said the Ordinance which created a Planning Commission was passed in 1939. In her experience, there had not been an abundance of applicants. She added the building official might have been included as a member for their knowledge base.

Commissioner Haag said if the Mayor was comfortable with it, the By-Laws should be left as they stand.

Consensus: By a consensus of the Planning Commission, the Mayor, as an ex officio member of the Commission would remain in the By-Laws per Article IV, Section 1.

The Planning Commission then discussed the addition of a background check to the application process.

Chair Thiesfeld said, as noted earlier, there were not a lot of applicants for Planning Commission. He did not feel a background check was necessary. He asked long-standing Commissioners if they had background information on the issue.

Commissioner Dunn replied, in the past few years, several people were appointed to the Planning Commission only to resign a short time later.

Chair Thiesfeld asked how a background check would alleviate that problem.

Commissioner Dunn replied her idea came from the application for City Council. It required a minimum residency period for eligibility. Her concern was that members of the Planning Commission should have some understanding of Junction City.

Planner Darnielle noted a background check was one way of reducing whatever liability might exist for the City.

Commissioner Hukill asked what the cost was for a background check.

Commissioner Dunn said that for her rentals the fee was \$45.00.

Chair Thiesfeld pointed out that the Commissioners were appointed whereas the Mayor and Councilors were elected. He felt a background check was a roadblock to potential applicants.

Commissioner Haag commented there was no way to know how long someone was going to be on the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Dunn said it did not need to be a formal background check. The Council applications asked questions such as, how long an applicant had lived in Junction City, whom they knew and their place of employment.

Chair Thiesfeld and Commissioner Haag agreed, those questions were appropriate.

Commissioner Sumner was not sure the question of length of residency was necessary.

A discussion took place regarding a possible new requirement for applicants to attend Planning Commission meetings prior to appointment. The benefits of this were that a newly appointed Planning Commissioner would understand what would be asked of them and they were up to date on current action items.

Commissioner Haag asked Planner Darnielle for his recommendations.

Planner Darnielle responded it could be an added comfort level for the Commission. There was no requirement in the State statutes for this.

Commissioner Solberg asked if the State statutes said anything about past criminal activities and the like.

Planner Darnielle answered a criminal background check would address this.

Commissioner Solberg asked if a question about criminal background could be on the application.

Planner Darnielle said it could.

There was general agreement that it would be helpful to have a period of residency prior to appointment to the Commission.

Administrator Bowers said it was not necessary to change the By-Laws for these requirements. An option might be to request applicants attend a Planning Commission meeting to introduce themselves.

Commissioners Haag and Dunn agreed with the suggestion.

Consensus: Consensus of the Commission was to make a change in practice to invite applicants to attend a Planning Commission meeting to introduce themselves.

Next, the Commission discussed the filling of vacancies and expired terms of office. Administrator Bowers explained, Ordinance 220 stated that when there was a vacancy, the Mayor appointed an applicant to file the unexpired term. The Planning Commission By-Laws were in conflict with the City Code. When there was a term expiration, the Mayor appointed an applicant with approval of City

Council. A vacancy was created by a resignation, death or leaving the area, not an expired term. Ordinance 220, Section (1)(E) defines the difference between the two.

To bring the Planning Commission By-Laws into accordance with Ordinance 220, the Commission needed to amend the By-Laws to state a vacancy shall be filled by the Mayor for the unexpired term of the predecessor in office.

Notice was necessary to amend the Planning Commission By-Laws. The current discussion acted as that notice should the Commission decide to amend the By-Laws. Approval of a motion to amend the By-Laws, Article IV, Section 4 could take place at the June Planning Commission meeting.

Administrator Bowers recommended updating the By-Laws to coincide with City Code.

Consensus: By a consensus of the Planning Commission staff was directed to prepare an amendment to Article IV, Section 4 of the Planning Commission By-Laws to bring the By-Laws into compliance with City Code related to filling a vacancy of an unexpired term.

VI. PLANNING AND BUILDING ACTIVITY REPORT

Administrator Bowers reviewed the Planning and Building activity report for the month of April 2014.

VII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Haag would like to take a closer look at the annexation agreement and its necessity to the annexation process.

Commissioner Dunn expressed appreciation for the discussion on updating the Planning Commissioner application process.

Commissioner Sumner suggested the Commission might look at the land partitioning process timeline.

Chair Thiesfeld asked the Commission if they wanted to look at this.

Commissioners voiced agreement.

Planner Darnielle did not think the City Code requirement to record an approved plat within 90-days was a statutory requirement. He would check. A possible option was to move the time limit out another 30.

Commissioner Sumner said he would like to see the Commission review land use application timelines in general.

Commissioner Haag agreed

Planner Darnielle offered to contact the County Surveyor's office to find out, on average, how long it took to record a final plat.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Commissioner Sumner made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Dunn seconded the motion.

Vote: Passed by a vote of 6:0:0. Chair Thiesfeld, Commissioners Dunn, Sumner, Haag, Solberg and Hukill voted in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting would be Tuesday, June 17, 2014 at 6:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tere Andrews, Planning Secretary

Jason Thiesfeld, Chair